ANIMAL LIBERATION FROM A GANDHIAN PERSPECTIV: POLITICAL AND SPIRITUAL FREEDOM IN THE *PURUSHARTHAS*

Michael Allen*

Abstract: In this article, I develop a Gandhian perspective on animal liberation. Indeed, I argue, against Gandhi himself, the traditional Hindu theory of the purusharthas, or goals of life, applies to non-human as well as human animals. In this respect, I adapt Parel's reading of Gandhi as reinterpreting the purusharthas through the philosophy of non-violence. In this reinterpretation, Gandhi, regards political freedom (swaraj) as the means to spiritual freedom (moksha). Gandhi is already an animal liberationist in the sense of advocating liberation for animals from violence and exploitation by humans. However, he does not also embrace the political turn in animal ethics, asserting that domesticated animals are co-citizens of the mixed polity. I further reinterpret the purusharthas through Gandhi's philosophy of non-violence to embrace this political turn. This combines three forms of liberation: negative freedom from exploitation, positive freedom to be a political participant, and freedom as spiritual growth and self-development. Not only does my argument provide a novel Gandhian perspective on animal liberation. It also challenges the political turn in animal ethics to embrace Gandhi's notion of spiritual liberation as a goal of life for the mixed, interspecies polity.

Introduction

Despite having developed a sophisticated philosophy of non-violence extending to non-human animals (henceforth animals), Gandhi has been treated with remarkable indifference by Western animal liberationists. This is surprising indeed. Like Western animal liberationists (Singer 1995, Regan 2004), Gandhi adopted a resolutely abolitionist position. Gandhi's concept of non-violence entails much more than protecting animal welfare, while also leaving animals under the butcher's knife. It demands abolishing the institutions and practices of animal slaughter. This is likewise the defining claim of the Western animal liberation movement: the abolition of all forms of animal exploitation, including slaughter and vivisection, thereby liberating animal lives from exploitation by humans. Nevertheless, animal ethics in the West has taken a new turn towards political theory. This political turn (Donaldson and Kymlicka, 2011) goes beyond the emphasis on abolition as liberation from exploitation and use. It conceives of domesticated animals themselves as political agents. Hence, 'liberation' for animals is not simply negative freedom from

* Dr. MICHAEL ALLEN, Professor, Department of Philosophy, East Tennessee State University. Email: allenmp@mail.etsu.edu.

exploitation by humans, but also a positive political freedom realized through their participation in shaping the norms of a mixed or interspecies polity, as co-citizens.

In this article, I ask whether Gandhi's philosophy of non-violence could embrace animal liberation as encompassing positive participation by animals in political life, characteristic of the turn. If so, this would not only combine the negative freedom of animals from exploitation by humans with their positive political freedom to participate as co-citizens of the polity. It would also combine these two freedoms with a third kind: that is, a positive spiritual freedom to experiment with new forms of companionship and cooperation, thereby expanding the circle of interconnectedness with others of the same and different species. Nevertheless, this combination of the 'three freedoms' -- freedom from exploitation, freedom to participate as a co-citizen of the polity, and freedom to grow spiritually in an enriched and expanded community -- fundamentally challenges a key feature of Gandhi's philosophy of non-violence. Gandhi insists on the *differentia specifica* of humans as their unique capacity to attain the third freedom, spiritual freedom or *moksha*: "No brute could ever aspire to *moksha*" (Parel, 2006, 22). Moreover, he makes this claim about *moksha* as the *differentia specifica* of humanity in the context of reinterpreting the traditional Indian doctrine of the *purusharthas*, or goals of life.

Indeed, the theoretical basis of Gandhi's reinterpretation of the *purusharthas* is that political freedom (*swaraj*) is "the very means" (Ibid, 15) to spiritual liberation: in other words, *swaraj* is the route to *moksha*. With this in mind, I ask a further question: viz., should the political turn embrace the idea that animals are not only the subjects of political *but also spiritual* liberation? As I show, some turn theorists (for example, Smith, 2012) appeal to the idea that recognizing the political status of domesticated animals is a means to human 'spiritual' self-development, in an expanded and restored community. Nevertheless, they do not extend this same insight into the prospects for such self-development to its animal members. This creates a lacuna in the political turn; a failure to account for the spiritual dimension of political freedom for animals, and not just humans. If, contrary to Gandhi himself, it can be demonstrated that the life goals of *purusharthas* apply equally to animals and humans, then the political turn could also be a spiritual turn.

I proceed in the following steps. First, I lay out Gandhi's reinterpretation of the *purusharthas*. Second, I briefly consider the relationship between political and spiritual freedom before, third, inquiring into the relationship of his philosophy of non-violence and animal liberationism. Fourth, I consider the possibility of Gandhi taking a political turn, going beyond his commitments to compassion for all suffering creatures and its reconciliation with economic power (*artha*) to endorsing animals as co-citizens, capable of attaining political freedom (*swaraj*). Fifth, I consider whether spiritual freedom (*moksha)* is plausibly an interspecies goal of the *purusharthas*, one turn theorists could embrace as filling a lacuna in their program.

My contribution in this article consists in opening an East/West dialogue on human relations with animals. If, contrary to Gandhi himself, the life goals of the *purusharthas* apply equally to animals and humans, then Western animal ethicists gain a valuable resource for thinking through, more completely and consistently, the implications of liberating animals. That is, liberating animals, not just from

exploitation but also, to participate politically, and, as such, to liberate themselves -- and not just humans -- *spiritually*, in an expanded and restored community *of all suffering life*.

I. Purusharthas Paradigms, Old and New

Indeed, I approach Gandhi's philosophy of non-violence through Parel's notion of a new Gandhian paradigm. This reinterprets the traditional Indian theory of the *purusharthas* or aims of life. These aims are as follows: ethics and religion (*dharma*), wealth and power (*artha*), pleasure (*kama*), and spiritual liberation or transcendence (*moksha*). Etymologically, *purusha* means 'immaterial spirit' while *artha* means 'for the sake of.' Hence, *purushartha* means, "that which is done for the sake of the immaterial spirit" (Parel, 2008, 46). Indeed, in Indian philosophical anthropology, humans are composites of their biological/material nature (*prakriti*) and spirit (*purusha*). Granted, the body has its relatively autonomous purposes, but these acquire their "full human significance" (Ibid) only by reference to the *purusha* or spirit. To this extent, any human activity that deliberately excludes reference to the purusharthas, and the ultimate aim of spiritual liberation (*moksha*), is "considered *pro tanto*, not beneficial to human well-being" (Ibid).

What, though, is new about Gandhi's 'new paradigm'? How does it differ from the traditional theory of the *purusharthas*? The traditional theory embeds the *purusharthas* as the last of four elements in the canon of Indian political thought, dating from the fourth century BC. The first of these elements was the plurality of sciences necessary for human flourishing, including philosophy, the Vedic science of revealed truths, political science, and economics; the second was monarchy as the normal form of government; the third was a hierarchical order of society based on caste. Indeed, these three elements created the general cultural conditions necessary to pursue the *purusharthas*. The first element is entirely benign from Gandhi's point of view: including the science of revealed truth in the plurality of science is essential to realizing the goal of spiritual liberation. However, the second and third elements are anything but benign.

Indeed, monarchy and caste embed the *purusharthas* in structures of state and cultural violence. On the one hand, in foreign policy, monarchy links the goal of wealth and power to an imperial war-system. The monarch was responsible for "the acquisition of things not possessed, the preservation of things possessed, and the augmentation of things preserved, and the bestowal of things augmented on a worthy recipient. On it is dependent the orderly maintenance of worldly life" (op. cit., 45). In other words, to the extent that it requires order and stability, even spiritual freedom or transcendence depends on imperial conquest and expansion: state violence. On the other hand, in domestic policy, monarchy links the enforcement of order and stability to social caste. Thus, hierarchy based on caste restricts 'untouchables' from effectively pursuing the aims of life necessary for human flourishing: cultural violence. In both respects, the *purusharthas* entail social structures that are profoundly violent and therefore -- in Gandhi's estimation -- *pro tanto* not beneficial to human flourishing.

From the eleventh century onwards, the ultimate goal of spiritual liberation was detached from political science. Instead, liberation required withdrawal from politics and worldly affairs. Not only did this produce disharmony in the plurality of sciences by detaching revealed truth from political science and economics, but also it resulted in a stagnation of Indian political thought lasting well into the modern age (Parel, 2006 & 2008). Indeed, Gandhi's new paradigm corrects for this stagnation by detaching the *purusharthas* from the structures of state and cultural violence. In this respect, he reinterpreted the *purusharthas* through a concept of non-violence (*ahimsa*) that ties spiritual liberation through experiential knowledge of revealed truth to political liberation (*swaraj*). This reinterpretation involved a highly complex synthesis of Hinduism, Tolstoyan Christianity, and Western political liberalism (see Gray and Hughes, 2015, also see Allen, 2018). While beyond the scope of my present inquiry to unpack fully this synthesis, I take the following as its gist.

All individuals are capable of engaging in experiments with Truth. Indeed, Truth (which is also God) is revealed not through divine intervention, but rather personal experience or 'seeing.' In other words, Truth is not, in the first instance, a function of the divine any more than it is a function of human rationality or reason. Indeed, human reason plays only a secondary role in interpreting experience. This is consistent with the plurality of sciences, in which philosophy as the means of reasoning (Parel, 2008, also see Halbfass, 1988) investigates the internal structure of the other sciences, including that of experientially revealed Truth. Nevertheless, Truth (as simultaneously God) is also Love. Viz., no individual self (*atman*) as Truth seeker is an isolated social atom, whose particular experiments with Truth/God fail to connect with the experiences of others. On the contrary, each individual is -- metaphorically speaking -- a drop in the ocean of universal Love (Gray and Hughes, 2015), thereby connecting each to all others (the interconnected whole of God/Truth, or *brahman*).

Regarding this confluence of God/Truth/Love, Gandhi contended that the "only means to Truth [God and Love] is Ahimsa" (op. cit., 184), or non-violence. No individual experience of Truth/God/Love is possible through the prevailing structures of state and cultural violence. For Gandhi, this meant that the legitimacy of the state, in addition to culture generally, depends on broad or majority public commitment to non-violence. Consequently, non-violence becomes the standard of both state and cultural legitimacy. Civic nationalism replaces monarchy and the imperial war-system. Indeed, in foreign policy, the legitimacy of the civic national state depends on the majority of its people repudiating cross-border aggression and expansionism (Parel, 2006 & 2008). In domestic policy, its legitimacy depends on a majority respecting one another's human rights to conduct and pursue their own experiments with Truth, working from diverse starting points in different cultural traditions, religious or secular (Grier, 2003, Lal, 2016). Overall, then, such egalitarian commitments by the majority to state and cultural non-violence -- as opposed to aggression and hierarchy -- become the conditions necessary for individual Truth seekers to pursue the *purusharthas*, and the ultimate goal of spiritual liberation.

II. Political and Spiritual Freedom

That said, however, what exactly is the bearing of Gandhi's extending the state and cultural legitimacy standard of non-violence to animals? Indeed, his reinterpretation of the *purusharthas* takes political freedom -- national and individual self-determination (*swaraj*) -- as the means to spiritual liberation. In this respect, however, he contends that such liberation or *moksha*, attained through political activity, is the *differentia specifica* of humanity. Here, I note a potential ambiguity in Gandhi's claim about the *differentia specifica*. On the one hand, does he mean that animals are incapable of spiritual freedom because they are incapable of political freedom? If this is the case, then the *differentia specifica* of humanity is both political types of freedom, political and spiritual. Or, on the other hand, does he mean that spiritual freedom alone distinguishes humans from animals? If this were the case, then he would presumably allow that one could talk meaningfully about animals' political liberation, while denying this is a means to their spiritual liberation.

One might take much of what Gandhi says about animals as supporting the first view: that they are capable of neither political nor spiritual liberation. At times, he refers to animals as dumb brutes, attributing the origins of humanity's violent dispositions to the law of the beast, as defined by submission to predatory forces (Burgat, 2004). Indeed, in his own words, "Man has by painful striving to surmount and survive the animal in him […]. Man must, therefore, if he is to realize his dignity and his own mission, cease to take part in the destruction and refuse to prey upon his weaker fellow creatures" (Ibid, op. cit., 230). In other words, as dumb brutes, animals are incapable of self-determination (*swaraj*) in light of a moral commitment to non-violence. That said, however, Gandhi also appeals to the cow as a "poem of pity" (op. cit., 231), symbol of nature as nourishing mother. Viz., "Cow-protection to me … means protection of all that lives and is helpless and weak in the world" (Ibid).

Such an appeal to animals as helpless and weak, rather than violent and predatory, obviously does nothing to contradict the view that animals are incapable of political freedom. Indeed, anything but positively self-determining, helpless and weak animals become the passive objects of human compassion and responsibility. Nevertheless, extending non-violence to animals does confer profound negative duties on humans. In particular, it confers on them negative duties to abolish hunting, butchery, and vivisection. How, though, does Gandhi's appeal to non-violence compare with Western animal liberationism? I next inquire into these similarities and differences.

III. Gandhi's Non-Violence and Western Animal Liberationism

Indeed, resulting in negative duties of abolitionism, Gandhi's extension of non-violence to animals appears strongly aligned with Western animal liberationism. Liberationists are likewise committed to a generalized ethic of non-violence, applying to animals as well as humans (Pellow, 2014, Francione and Charlton, 2015). They are further committed to extensive programs of abolitionism, freeing animals from exploitation and use by humans, in zoos, factory farms, scientific research facilities,

and so on (Giroux, 2016). Nevertheless, important differences emerge between the Gandhian and Western liberationist commitments to non-violence and abolitionism.
In particular, Western animal liberationism is premised on rejecting any claims about the *differentia specifica* of humanity. To be sure, like the Indian tradition criticized by Gandhi, Western religious and moral traditions also make such a claim distinguishing humans from animals. However, they identify the *differentia specifica* with human reason and rationality, as opposed to spirituality and transcendence. This is evident in the Abrahamic religious traditions of the West, according to which rational humanity rightfully exercises dominion over dumb creation, justifying violence to animals for human ends (Kymlicka and Donaldson, 2014).

Indeed, denouncing such violence, Western liberationists stress animals and humans are more different in degree than kind. As such, they apply non-violence to animals based not on difference -- as Gandhi had done in reinterpreting the *purusharthas* -- but rather commonality with humans. Hence, both animals and humans are sentient (Singer, 1995), equally capable of pleasure and pain. Moreover, both typically have interests (Feinberg, 1974) in enjoying the one while avoiding the other. Consequently, liberationists advocate equal consideration for sentience-based interests of all animal life (Cochrane, 2012). However, this egalitarian stress on equal considerability, across species lines, is surely just as much a repudiation of Gandhi's own hierarchical appeal to spirituality over rationality as alternative *differentia specifica* of humanity in Indian tradition, as opposed to Western Abrahamic religions and Marxism.

In sum, Gandhi and Western animal liberationists could agree on liberating suffering animals from exploitation and use by humans through satisfying negative duties of abolition. Further, neither take a stand on whether animals are capable of active political participation; neither, in other words, take a political turn towards endorsing animal co-citizenship. What, though, might one say about the most distinctive Gandhian claim, regarding the extension of non-violence to animals and humanity's spiritual progress? One might expect animal liberationists to take a dim view of this aspect of Gandhi's thought. After all, one might think that asserting humanity's spiritual freedom, while denying any equivalent progress for animals, contradicts Western animal liberationists' species egalitarianism.

Nevertheless, that is rather hasty. Equal consideration of interests in not suffering is not the same as having equal interests (Singer, 1995). Western liberationists might agree with Gandhi that animals are incapable of spiritual liberation and, as such, have no interest in *moksha*. To be sure, they should repudiate Gandhi's demeaning language about the animal origins of human violence and humans having to overcome the animal in them. That said, however, they can still reconcile with Gandhi to the extent he is a species egalitarian where it really counts equal consideration for animal suffering. It is not morally objectionable to say animals have no interest in *moksha* than it is to say they have no interest in voting or holding elected office (Cochrane, 2012). Indeed, such differences have no bearing on the extension of non-violence to animals or the imperative of abolitionism.

Moreover, liberationists might then say, 'We can agree with Gandhi that humans might well benefit spiritually from satisfying abolitionist duties.' Abolitionism

presents a radical challenge to the materialism of modern society. Indeed, abolishing the capitalist industrial meat production system demands repudiating enormous profits, and the easy satisfactory of popular dietary preferences, at the expense of suffering animals. To this extent, Western animal liberationists could accommodate, at least, some of Gandhi's distinctive claim regarding non-violence -- extended to animals -- and the spiritual progress of humanity. At the very least, they could embrace a broad conception of human spirituality as transcending majority acceptance of violence to animals for human ends. That, however, leaves unanswered the question of any possible Gandhian endorsement of a political turn to regarding animals as co-citizens.

IV. Could Gandhi make a Political Turn?

By contrast with the animal liberationist emphasis on negative duties to abolish all social institutions that dominate and exploit animals, the political turn in animal ethics is defined, in large part, by its ascription of positive citizenship rights to animals (Donaldson and Kymlicka, 2011, Smith, 2012). To be sure, not all animals can or should be our co-citizens. If submitted to predatory forces of the law of beasts, many wild animals are also members of independent self-governing communities. Indeed, the value of sovereignty confers on humans both negative duties of non-interference and positive duties of assistance, for instance, when natural calamities threaten the sovereign integrity of such communities. Further, many animals occupy a liminal position in relation to humans, having adapted to living alongside human settlements, but without becoming co-participants in human households or other social institutions. Humans owe them recognition of their right to be present in and around human settlements, while also respecting that they otherwise lead substantially independent lives.

Nevertheless, humans breed and socialize domesticated animals to be participants in social institutions, ranging from households to farms, in addition to public health and security institutions (Garner and O'Sullivan, 2016). Indeed, domestication establishes a special relationship of co-membership in the mixed polity, or *Zoopolis* (Donaldson and Kymlicka, 2011). Prima facie, however, such a relationship is quite different from that envisaged by Gandhi to the domestic cow, as poem of pity. Gandhi did not regard the cow as a self-determining (*swaraj*) citizen of the civic constitutional national state. Instead, he regarded the cow, and domesticated animals generally, as objects of compassion and responsibility by human citizens, for whom extending non-violence to animals is a condition of their spiritual progress (*moksha*). To this extent, one might think that a political turn, for Gandhi, is not in the cards.

That said, however, Gandhi also devoted considerable attention throughout his life to rethinking non-violent human social relations with domesticated animals not in terms of political or spiritual freedoms, but rather an alliance of ethics and economics (Burgat, 2004), or, in the language of the *purusharthas*, wealth and power (*artha*). In particular, he sought to redesign animal husbandry saving cows from the butcher's knife. This meant their "slaughter should become expensive and useless" (Ibid, 242), indeed doing nothing to maximize the wealth and power of self-determining citizens

seeking Truth/God/Love. According to Gandhi, slaughter can be avoided, thereby meeting the ethical imperative of non-violence, by using all parts of husbanded animals while they are alive and following their natural deaths. To this extent, he stressed the economic value of non-violent animal products (*ahinsak*), ranging from milk, urine, and dung, to *ahinsak* leather products developed from the carcasses of animals that had died naturally, rather than slaughtered for their hides.

Indeed, a significant part of Gandhi's reform of animal husbandry consisted in the reform of traditional Indian social institutions providing homes or shelters (*goshalas* and *pinjrapoles*) for stay or abandoned animals, or those otherwise bound for the abattoir. Not only should these institutions be reformed to provide an educational function in teaching citizens about the ethical imperative of non-violence, but also, they should be made economically productive by having dairies and tanneries attached to them. Above all, Gandhi's alliance of ethics (*dharma*) and economic (*artha*) is based on a rather hard-headed recognition that citizens must fully integrate husbanded animals into society, as economically productive social members. Unless they are economically productive, such animals are unlikely to become the beneficiaries of non-violence, undermining the spiritual progress of humanity.

In this respect, Gandhi clearly sees helpless and suffering domesticated animals as more than just a poem of pity. They are also essential to one of the goals of life identified in the theory of the *purusharthas*: that is, non-violent forms of wealth and power (*artha*) as a condition of citizens' spiritual liberation (*moksha*). Nevertheless, his 'economic turn' in animal ethics still fails to engage with the idea of animals themselves as co-citizens. In other words, his economic turn is not also a political turn. However, Gandhi might be justly criticized for not engaging with the political dimensions of human relations to domesticated animals. Part of his discussion of the reform of animal husbandry addresses the cultural violence of social caste. In addition to protecting vulnerable animals, the reforms address social and religious stigma against untouchables. Indeed, they should be adequately compensated by the state for skinning dead animals and for the profits derived from exploiting the different parts of the carcasses (Burgat, 2004).

Gandhi, though, does not consider that animals themselves remain another kind of social caste. However, the ongoing caste status of domesticated animals is the primary insight of the political turn (Donaldson and Kymlicka, 2015). In this respect, turn theorists argue by analogy not with untouchables but rather people with disabilities. The disability rights movement in the West has adopted a 3P model of liberation: protection, provision, *and participation*. Viz., liberation for people with disabilities entails not just protection against overt abuse and provision of material resources, but also participation in rule making. Indeed, without participation in shaping the rules of social cooperation, people with disabilities necessarily remain second-class citizens, or wards of the state. Gandhi's civic national state extends the third P to untouchables, guaranteeing their political liberation (*swaraj*) as self-determining citizens.

Nevertheless, it does not consider any such extension to domesticated animals, leaving them passive recipients of protection and provision. Hence, from the perspective of Western turn theorists, Gandhi's reforms of animal husbandry treat

domesticated animals *unjustly*, reducing them to second class citizens, despite its positive reformist guarantee of the first two Ps. I ask, however, whether he *could* also extend the third P to domesticated animals, regarding them as co-citizens. To answer this question, I consider the case developed by turn theorists for extending positive participation rights as citizens to domesticated animals, before asking whether this could be acceptable to Gandhi, and whether he should further adapt the theory of the *purusharthas* to include domesticated animals.

The disability rights movements articulate two major objections to denying participation rights to persons with disabilities. (1) Those responsible for administering the first two Ps to such persons deny them "opportunities for mobility, exploration, choice, learning, challenge -- all potentially crucial to well-being" (Donaldson & Kymlicka 2015b, 327). (2) This leads to 'oppressive terms of cooperation … set unilaterally by one party, which makes unfairness in benefits and burdens virtually inevitable' (Ibid). Clearly, Gandhi's reforms of animal husbandry are vulnerable to these objections. While seeing animals as subjects of compassion, Gandhi says nothing about humans owing them opportunities for mobility, exploration, choice, learning, and so on. Instead, he justifies his reforms unilaterally in terms of economic benefits to humans. Domesticated animals continue to work for human benefit. Nevertheless, Gandhi says nothing that would indicates he recognizes the need to justify these arrangements as 'fair' to the animals themselves, in light of any such range of social opportunities.

That said, however, participation overcomes the above objections only insofar as it entails a "new conception of *political* agency" (Ibid, 331). This conception of political agency is new in that it departs from the traditional "ideal of an articulate, autonomous agent engaged in public reason in the public square" (Ibid) by virtue of the "ability to articulate and understand propositions" (Kymlicka & Donaldson, 2014). Moreover, the traditional ideal demands political agents satisfy a "threshold individual capacity for rational reflection and public deliberation" (Ibid). This, however, leaves open the door to a Gandhian endorsement of the political agency of domesticated animals. As I have stressed all along, Gandhi denies the *differentia specifica* for humans is rationality. Nevertheless, turn theorists must give an appropriate account of how they could participate in shaping the terms of cooperation for the polity: in other words, how such animals could exercise political freedom (*swaraj*).

Here, turn theorists stress that failure to meet the rationality threshold is no more an impediment to political agency and participation for animals than it is for many humans, such as those with severe cognitive disabilities. Political agency may be expressed not only through 'our conscious minds' but also our 'bodily life' (Krause 2011, 317). Further, capacities for agency are always 'socially sustained' and distributed (Donaldson and Kymlicka 2015a, 331; also see their 2015b and 2014). Whether expressed through our conscious minds or our bodies, agency 'emerges out of the communicative exchanges, background meanings, social interpretations, personal intentions, self-understandings, and bodily encounters through which one's identity is manifest through one's deeds' (Krause 2011, 317). To this extent, agents are *inter*dependent rather than *in*dependent, indeed requiring the help (Francis &

Silvers, 2007, Meijer, 2013) of others to express their agency through such multifarious exchanges and encounters.

This is surely consonant with Gandhi's conception of Truth/God/Love in which all individual selves (*atman*) are interconnected. In the mixed or interspecies polity, domesticated animals are political agents by virtue of their capacities for non-linguistic "internatural" communication with humans (von Essen & Allen, 2017). Nevertheless, humans are obliged by the non-linguistic character of their communicative exchanges and encounters with such animals to bring "citizenship into the spaces where membership and participation are meaningful" to them as social members and participants. For example, Donaldson and Kymlicka appeal to three illustrative cases, city dog parks, animal assisted therapy (AAT) and farmed animal sanctuaries (FASs).

The first case illustrates how domesticated animals have transmitted to human their desire to "claims a space to run and to socialize … leading to new social norms, often with markedly better outcomes for both humans and animals" (2015a, 332, also see their 2011). This case is perhaps culturally specific to the West and its traditions of household companionship with 'pets.' Nevertheless, it is plausibly interpreted as a particular expression of non-violence philosophy in practice. Indeed, internatural communication with dogs results in their exercising political freedom (*swaraj*) by changing the norms for urban landscapes and planning. In terms of the *purusharthas*, not only does this promote the goal of political freedom but also pleasure (*kama*) across species lines: city dog parks promote *kama* for dogs and their human companions alike. That said, however, this case does little to engage the economic goal of non-violent wealth and power (*artha*) of primary interest to Gandhi.

The second case, however, does engage the goal of *artha*. It is premised on the idea that therapy animals are often oppressed and exploited in their work relations with humans. Nevertheless, that this need not be so. Indeed, Donaldson and Kymlicka contend that "it is fully possible to create choice situations in which DAs can safely explore different types of work, and can then manifest their enthusiasm for some forms of AAT and their indifference or dislike for other forms" (Donaldson & Kymlicka 2015a, 332). Here, internatural communication promotes interspecies *swaraj* and *kama*, as well as *artha*. ATT animals and humans collaborate in devising work norms that are meaningful to them both. Not only are persons with disabilities empowered to enter the economy, but also the animals become essential economic contributors, beyond providing milk, along with products derived from their carcasses on the event of their natural death.

In their third case, Donaldson and Kymlicka critically explore experiments in FASs as "intentional communities" dedicated to rescuing "formerly farmed" animals from the agricultural industry. In some respects, this discussion echoes Gandhi's attempts to reform traditional Indian animal sanctuaries (*goshalas* and *pinjrapoles*). In both cases, animals once farmed for their meat are extended protection and provision. Donaldson and Kymlicka's reforms of FASs, however, go a step further. Indeed, they stress the dependent nature of animal agency and the imperative of scaffolding their choices. Scaffolding begins with "safe and secure social membership" in the sanctuary, but then progresses to "new activities, experiences, and learning moments

… intelligible and meaningful" to the individual animals (Donaldson and Kymlicka 2015b, 64). While not uncritical of FASs, Donaldson and Kymlicka see them as important social experiments in 'dismantling caste status for DAs' (Ibid).

In addition to these illustrative cases, Donaldson and Kymlicka in addition to other turn theorists (Smith, 2012) appeal to the representation of animals in more traditional spaces for public deliberation and political decision-making. Indeed, drawing from "existing models of ombudspeople or advocates," they contend all "institutions which have significant impacts on animals could be required to have an animal advocate" (Donaldson and Kymlicka, 2015a, 333). Such an official representative would be "informed, in turn, by the input of human trustees responsible for soliciting and interpreting the subjective good of different animal individuals or groups" (Ibid). For his part, Gandhi offers no equivalent discussion of the political representation of domesticated animals.

However, I see no in-principle reason why Gandhi, or a present-day Gandhian, could not accept this turn to the political representation of domesticated animals, as long as they grant such animals are not agents and participants based on rational and linguistic capacities. Gandhi's civic national state includes multiple structures of political participation and representation from the smallest to largest units of units of civic activity (Parel, 2008, Allen, 2018). Here, the question is not whether domesticated animals should be represented. Instead, it is how best to adapt the imperative of representing them to the particular multi-level political structures advocated by Gandhi. This is a question of policy, not philosophy. Reinterpreted through the philosophy of non-violence, domesticated animal participation -- including their political representation -- advances the various goals of the *purusharthas*.

At any rate, I have argued the political liberation (*swaraj*) of such animals through their participation and representation in the mixed polity advances *kama*, and *artha*, as interspecies goals. To this extent, I contend Gandhi could make a political turn in animal ethics via the philosophy of non-violence. However, this still leaves *moksha* -- that is, spiritual as opposed political liberation -- which he claims is the *differentia specifica* of humanity. I ask next if the *swaraj* of domesticated animals is exclusively a means to the *moksha* of humans, or if there is also a possible Gandhian perspective on spiritual liberation as an interspecies goal of the *purusharthas*.

V. *Moksha*: Need Animals Not Apply?

It is commonplace for turn theorists to claim that animals can facilitate the liberty and even spiritual liberty of humans. For example, Smith (2012) argues that extending political representation to animals "is not only consistent with human freedom but can also further it" (Ibid, 123). She appeals to a short story by Alice Walker, *I am Blue*, to make this claim. In the story, Blue is a horse whose owner allows him the company of a mate for a short time until the mare was successfully impregnated and taken away again. When his owner takes away his companion, Blue is obviously distressed: he was "like a crazed person" (op cit., 124). Indeed, Blue gives Walker a look she reports is "so piercing, so full of grief, I almost laughed (I felt too sad to cry)" (Ibid).

However, Blue does not suffer because he is unable to communicate with his owner or Walker. As Smith puts it, he suffers because his "owner never had to consider Blue's feelings in the matter:" Blue's suffering is thus an "artefact of [human] domination" over animals (Ibid).

The result is not just a breakdown of the bonds of community between Blue and his owner, but also with Walker as an oppressed black woman, a victim of racism and sexism. To be sure, Blue's immediate source distress is his lack of companionship with a mate of his own species. Nevertheless, Smith contends that changing community norms to represent his interest in companionship with his own species could also open up new possibilities for companionship with humans. Hence, failing to represent this interest, Blue's owner effectively deprived Walker of "what might have been a healing relationship with the horse … a source of companionship … important for her own self-development and healing" (Ibid). In other words, taking into consideration Blue's interests and preferences in devising community term of interspecies cooperation could have helped to "restore community" (Ibid, 123) and belonging *for Walker*.

Indeed, the friendship-that-might-have-been with Blue could have facilitated her deeper participation in a community fractured by oppression and disempowerment. In Gandhi's language of spiritual liberation, this hypothetical friendship with Blue could have been a 'drop in the ocean,' expanding the ripples or circles of interconnectedness with other selves (*atman*), bringing her closer to an experience of Truth/God/Love. That said, however, Smith could have generalized her point about Blue's potential to restore fractured human community to his owner as oppressor. If he had seen what Blue tried to communicate about his suffering, Blue's owner might likewise have benefitted from a friendship with his horse, healing him of his insensitivity to the suffering of others, including minority women like Walker. In this respect, Blue could have facilitated the spiritual development and progress of *both human oppressor and oppressed*.

Most striking in the present context, however, Smith does not generalize her point about Blue facilitating a restoration of community and belonging *to Blue himself*, as an oppressed animal. Presumably, though, Blue would be as much a beneficiary of restored bonds of civic friendship and co-citizenship as his owner and Walker. After all, his representation as co-citizen of the community would -- in Donaldson and Kymlicka's (2015b) language -- create opportunities for him to experiment with "new activities, experiences, and learning moments … intelligible and meaningful" (Ibid, 64) to him, across species lines with his owner, Walker, or any others selves, animal or human, he may encounter, as co-citizen of the mixed polity. Adapting the language of Gandhi's reinterpretation of the *purusharthas*, Blue is liberated to pursue his own individual experiments with Truth, thereby expanding his circle of interspecies interconnections, interrelationships.

He is thus liberated not just politically *but also spiritually* to the extent this community establishes the general cultural conditions (Parel, 2006 and 2008) in which such experiments are an *equal possibility for all* of its member-species. Indeed, if I am correct, then Gandhi's claim regarding *moksha* as the *differential specifica* of humanity must be rejected. Not only does this require a significant change in

Gandhi's philosophical perspective, but also that of the political turn. On the one hand, Gandhi is called upon to abandon his hierarchical view of animal/human relations, embracing instead the view of such relations favored by Western animal liberationists and turn theorists alike of differences of degree and not kind. On the other hand, turn theorists are called upon to consider the spiritual dimension of political freedom, embracing the key insight of Gandhi's reinterpretation of the *purusharthas*.

Indeed, Gandhi's philosophy is only enriched by embracing animal *moksha*. It is stripped of its least appealing aspect: its patronizing view of animals by comparison with humans (Burgat, 2004). Further, it suffers no loss as far as humans are concerned, if animal and human lives are empowered simultaneously, in restored and expanded community, through the intersection of different oppressions. As for the turn, it is only improved through embracing animal *moksha* in relation to co-citizenship and representation. As I have shown above, Smith's reading of *I Am Blue* is oddly incomplete without recognizing the spiritual benefits of such expanded community relations for Blue as well as Walker.

Nevertheless, the situation is perhaps rather different, say, for an animal liberationist who does not embrace animal co-citizenship and political participation. For such an 'old school' liberationist, animal *swaraj* and *moksha* are hardly combined in a single Gandhian package of interspecies lifegoals, if animals are not political participants in the ways discussed by turn theorists. Nevertheless, even such a liberationist could find reasons to argue that Gandhi is wrong about *moksha* as the defining characteristic of humans over animals. For example, amidst videos of animals fighting, YouTube abounds with videos of oddball animal adoptions. Most of these involve domesticated animals: cats adopting puppies or rabbits, and so on.

However, some involve wild animals whose behaviors, according to Gandhi, are governed by the ultra-violent law of beasts. Here, the veterinarian, Linda Bender, relates a wild animal oddball adoption story "so outlandish that few people would believe it had it not been filmed" (2014, 51) by a documentary crew. A female leopard kills a female baboon, but then desists from feeding on its carcass when she discovers an infant baboon still clinging to its mother's dead body. Indeed, ignoring her 'kill,' the leopard proceeded to nurse the ailing infant baboon through the rest of the day and through the night until it eventually died of exposure the next morning.

Nevertheless, one might object that this discussion sets the bar for animal *moksha* rather low. It assumes that spiritual liberation consists in experiments with expanded interconnections and interrelationships to others, reaching across the multiple boundaries of species, horse to human, cat to rabbit, leopard to infant baboon, etc. This expanding circle view of interspecies interconnectedness is not inconsistent with Gandhi's conception of spirituality. However, it is surely incomplete. Indeed, one of the lifegoals of the *purusharthas* is religion and ethics or *dharma*. Gandhi assumes that individual experiments with Truth entail devotional (*bhakti*) engagements in particular religious traditions (Gray and Hughes, 2015, Lal, 2016), Hindu, Christian, Buddhist, Moslem, and so on. In other words, individual experiments with Truth are facilitated by many different kinds of devotional practices and observances. However, horses, cats, and leopards are neither Hindu, Christian, Buddhist, nor Moslem.

Animals are not inducted into analogical practices of religious discipline, voluntarily submitting to such disciple over time as they grow in spiritual insight. Indeed, animals often exhibit considerable self-discipline in their behaviors towards one another as well as humans. Wild sovereign animals are inducted into the norms and disciple of the pack; domesticated animals, like ATT dogs, undergo extensive training in self-discipline and restraint. Nevertheless, such processes of animals learning self-discipline and restraint are not equivalent to religious discipline or observance. In this respect, human devotional practices are similar to human political practices. Both entail linguistic capacities for corporate as opposed to primary agency (Carter and Charles, 2013).

Corporate agency is the capacity to identify with all members of some relevant group. Hence, the concept of human rights in Gandhi's civic national state entails that its citizens have capacities to see themselves as members of the group of Indian national citizens across multiple levels of civic participation, as well as the citizens of all other states in the international order (Parel 2006 and 2008). Ultimately, all citizens can see themselves as connected to all others as members of humanity, even though they have never met and will never meet the vast majority of the other members of this group. Indeed, this is a function of the self-referential, indexical properties of human language, permitting generalizations from particular instances to all members of a group or class.

Likewise, human religious observances entail capacities for such corporate or group agency among devotees. In Gandhi's example of Hindu cow worship, the cow is a symbol for all suffering life. Indeed, by virtue of their linguistic capabilities, humans can grasp this symbolic meaning of the cow as indexical marker for all suffering. To this extent, devotional observance of the sacral character of the cow facilitates human spiritual growth (Jurgenmeyer, 1984) in Truth/God/Love. However, the cow is incapable of such corporate agency identifying itself with all suffering life. It is a primary rather than corporate agent. In other words, it is capable of primary-level responsiveness to other agents within its immediate relational field, but otherwise incapable of corporate-level generalizations.

Hence, on this analysis, the cow -- and all other animals without linguistic capacities for corporate agency-- is incapable of *moksha*. Indeed, the analysis appears to show that Gandhi was correct about *moksha* as the *differentia specifica* of humanity, after all. Nevertheless, liberationists and turn theorists would point out that not all humans, like those with severe cognitively disabilities, could qualify for *moksha*, on such a standard for leading a spiritual life. However, one might well object that the standard is unreasonably restrictive. Human persons with Down's syndrome, for instance, cannot participate fully in the deliberative functions of citizenship, debating complex policy issues, or grasp fully -- depending on the severity of their condition -- abstract conceptions of universal citizenship and human rights, or, for that matter, their interconnectedness with *all* suffering creatures in the abstract.

Nevertheless, they are still capable of expanding their connections to others within their immediate relational field. To this extent, on a more relaxed interpretation of Gandhian Truth/God/Love, they are capable of *moksha*. Indeed, if this much is

granted for humans with severe cognitive disabilities, then, by parity of reasoning, the same should be granted for animals, such as the horse, Blue, in Alice Walker's short story, and the female leopard in Bender's oddball wild animal adoption story. Hence, incapability for corporate-level abstractions is no disqualifier for *moksha* with the parameters of animal capabilities for agency. However, is this more relaxed interpretation of *moksha* for animals warranted? I see no reason why not.

As I noted in the previous section, the political turn is premised on animal political participation departing from the ideal of an articulate agent satisfying a threshold capability for rational reflection, and corporate-level abstractions. If animal political freedom or *swaraj* demands a 'new conception of political agency' adapted to the actual capabilities of animals, then animal spiritual freedom or *moksha* demands a similar adaptation to a new conception of spiritual agency. That is, it must be premised on departing from any ideal of spirituality demanding equivalent linguistic capabilities facilitating corporate-level abstractions, excluding not only animals but also some human political participants and social members. In Parel's (2006 and 2008) language for the *purusharthas*, such a new conception is necessary for 'creating the cultural conditions' in which *all* such participants and social members may undertake diverse experiments with Truth, in a *political and spiritual* interspecies community.

Conclusion: the *Purusharthas*, Political and Spiritual Freedom

Appealing to Parel's reading of Gandhi's reinterpretation of the *purusharthas*. I have developed a Gandhian perspective on animal liberation. The heart of Gandhi's reinterpretation of the purusharthas is his embrace of political freedom (*swaraj*) as the means to spiritual freedom (*moksha*). Nevertheless, this perspective is 'Gandhian' in that it departs from Gandhi himself in crucial respects. It repudiates his insistence on *moksha* as the *differentia specifica* of humanity, instead regarding animal and humans as both subjects of spiritual liberation. Indeed, it extends *moksha* to animals by embracing the political turn in animal ethics. This turn goes beyond seeing animals as merely the subjects of negative, abolitionist duties to seeing them also as positive participants and co-citizens of the mixed polity. To this extent, it combines three types of freedom, applying equally to all suffering life, animal and human: (1) freedom *from* exploitation, (2) freedom *to* participate politically, and (3) freedom *to* grow spiritually. That is, freedom to grow through expanding community relations between different species cooperating with one another in realizing common life goals of pleasure, prosperity, and self-development. Further, the Gandhian perspective I have offered challenges Western animal liberationists and turn theorists, in particular, to embrace the latter goal of spiritual self-development. Indeed, I have argued embracing this goal, in an expanded and restored interspecies community, resolves a lacuna in political turn theory, as inconsistently attributing 'spiritual' self-development to humans, but not animals.

References

Allen, Michael. 2018. "Working towards the Devotional Ideal: Gandhi on the Non-Ideal Status of Liberal Institutions and Values. *Journal of East-West Thought*, forthcoming.
Allen, Michael and Erica von Essen. 2018. "Religion, Critical Animal Studies, and the Political Turn: Animal Belonging and Participation from Secular and Religious Perspectives." *Journal for Critical Animal Studies*, 15(4), 1-30.
Bender, Linda. 2014. *Animal Wisdom: Learning from the Spiritual Lives of Animals*. North Atlantic Books: Berkeley, California.
Burgat, Florence. 2004. "Non-Violence Towards Animals in the Thinking of Gandhi: The Problem of Animal Husbandry." *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics,* 17(3), 223-248.
Carter, Bob and Nickie Charles. 2013. "Animal, Agency, and Resistance." *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior*, 43(3) 322-340.
Cochrane, Alasdair. 2012. Animal Rights Without Liberation: Applied Ethics and Human Obligations. New York: Columbia University Press.
Donaldson, Sue and Will Kymlicka. 2011. *Zoopolis: A Political Theory of Animal Rights*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
_____. 2015a. "Farmed Animal Sanctuaries: The Heart of the Movement? *Animals and Politics,* 1, 50-74.
_____. 2015b. "Interspecies Politics: A Reply to Hinchcliffe and Ladwig." *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 23(3) 321-344.
Fan, Ruipang. 2010. "How should we treat animals? A Confucian Reflection." *Dao* 9(1), 79-96.
Feinberg, Joel. 1974. "The Rights of Animals and Unborn Generations." In *Philosophy and Environmental Crisis*, William Blackstone, ed. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 43-68.
Francione, Gary and Ana Charlton. 2015, *Animal Rights: The Abolitionist Approach*. Exempla Press.
Francis Leslie and Anita Silvers. 2007. "Liberalism and individually scripted ideas of the good: Meeting the challenge of dependent agency." *Social Theory and Practice,* 33(2) 311-334
Garner, Robert and Siobhan O'Sullivan. 2016. *Political Turn in Animal Ethics*. London: Rowman and Littlefield.
Giroux, Valery. 2016. "Animals Do Have an Interest in Liberty. *Journal of Animal Ethics,* 6(1) 20-43.
Gray, Stuart and Thomas Hughes. 2015. "Gandhi's Devotional Political Thought." *Philosophy East and West,* 65(2) 375-400.
Grier, Nicholas. 2003. "Nonviolence as a Civic Virtue: Gandhi and Reformed Liberalism." *International Journal of Hindu Studies,* 7, 75-97.
Halbfass, Wilhelm. 1988. *India and Europe*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
Juergenmeyer, Mark. 1984." Gandhi and the Cow: The Ethics of Human/Animal Relationships." *Between the Species,* 1(1) 11-17.
Krause, S. 2011. "Bodies in Action: Corporeal Agency and Democratic Politics." *Political Theory,* 39(3), 299-324.
Kymlicka, Will and Sue Donaldson. 2014. "Animal Rights, Multiculturalism and the Left." *Journal of Social Philosophy,* 45(1) 116-135.
Lal, Sanjay. 2016. "Gandhi's Synthesis of Liberal and Communitarian Values: Its Basis and Insights." *Journal of East-West Thought*, 6(3) 29-43.
Meijer, Eva. 2013. Political communication with animals. *Humanimalia,* 5(1)

Parel, Anthony. 2008. "Gandhi and the Emergence of the Modern Indian Political Canon." *Review of Politics*, 70(1) 40-63.

_____. 2006. *Gandhi's Philosophy and the Quest for Harmony*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pellow, David Naguib, 2014. *Total Liberation: The Power and Promise of Animal Rights and the Radical Earth Movement*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Singer, Peter. 1995. *Animal Liberation*. Pimlico.

Smith, Kimberley. 2012. *Governing Animals: Animal Welfare and the Liberal State*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Reagan, Tom. 2004. The Case for Animal Rights. Berkeley CA: California University Press.

Von Essen, Erica and Michael Allen. 2017. "Solidarity Between Human and Non-Human Animals: Representing Animal Voices in Policy Deliberations." *Environmental Communication*, 11(5) 641-653.